33. The need for additional protection for persons exempted from personal attendance in Civil Courts.

Mr. Narayanar Janardanar (Member, Jenmi, Trivandrum Division) said that, when a person exempted from personal attendance in Courts was examined on commission, he was asked to pay the commissioner's batta. The batta should be required to the paid by the party at whose instance he had to be examined on commission.

Another safe-guard required was that the persons exempted should be exempted from civil warrants also. In *exparte* decisions, the absence of such a provision was causing vexation and humiliation to them. He proposed that a provision should be made that they could be arrested under civil warrants only if it be found, after an attachment of their immovable property, if any, that the decree could not be satisfied.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

34. The need for shifting the Additional Munsiff's Court at Trivhndrum to Nedumangad.

Mr. Sankaran Krishnan (Member, Nedumangad taluk) said that the Nedumangad taluk, having an area of 366 square miles, was the fifth taluk in the State in point of area. The population also numbered 1,00,000. In the Trivandrum Division, there were four taluks. Of those, two taluks had two Munsiffs' Courts each, and the Trivandrum taluk had three Munsiffs' Courts. In Nedumangad alone, there was no Munsiff's Court. The people of the taluk had been experiencing much difficulty in having to go for their civil cases to all the other three taluks of the division. The greatest distance to be travelled was about 42 miles from Kallar. It also not infrequently occurred that the parties had to attend on the same day two and three Courts. He said that there could be no apprehension that there would not be enough work for a Munsiff at Nedumangad, as the statistics furnished by him in 1086 at the Assembly would show. The Member requested that the temporary Munsiff's Court at Trivandrum might be shifted to Nedumangad.

Dewan's reply.—The High Court will be asked if there would be sufficient work for a Munsiff's Court at Nedumangad if one were established there.

35. The desirability of retransferring the pakuthies of Veliyam and Velinallore from the jurisdiction of the Quilon to that of the Kottarakara Munsiff.

Mr. Padmanabhan Kochukunju (Member, Kottarakara taluk) represented that the distance from the *pakuthi* of Veliyam to Quilon was from 20 to 24 miles and to Kottarakara 4 to 8 miles, and that from the Velinallore *pakuthi* to Quilon was from 16 to 24 miles and to Kottarakara 8 to 10 miles. Under such circumstances, the transfer of the *pakuthies* from the jurisdiction of the Kottarakara Munsiff to that of the Quilon Munsiff was a source of great hardship to the people. Further, all the other public offices were in Kottarakara. The number of suits in the two *pakuthies* would be but few, and having regard to his present file, they could be easily disposed of by the Munsiff at Kottarakara. The Member requested that the *pakuthies* of Veliyam and Velinallore should therefore be retransferred to the jurisdiction of the Kottarakara Munsiff. He also presented a memorial from the inhabitants of the two *pakuthies* containing the same prayer.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

36. The need for the establishment of a Munsiff's Court at Changanacherri.

Mr. Mathai Verghese (Member, Trading Classes, Changanacherri) expressed, on behalf of the trading classes of Changanacherri, their feelings of gratitude to His Highness the Maha Raja and the Dewan for granting them the privilege of electing a Member for the Assembly. Proceeding to the subject, he said that, under the present arrangement, the people of the taluk had to go for their civil cases to Thiru-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly